

Approved For Release 2004/09/03 : CIA-RDP88-01314R000100550008-7

Stimulating public discussion of American foreign policy.

By Arnold Beichman

Cambridge, Mass.

These days the life of a Harvard professor is not a happy one, particularly if the subject matter of his teaching and research is regarded as imperialist and reactionary among budding campus revolutionaries. Even if, like Prof. Samuel P. Huntington, he has three different Harvard offices, he would still hesitate to regard any of them as the sanctuaries they might once have been.

That is why the basement of his three-story home on Brimmer Street in Boston proper is crammed with three huge metal cabinets and more than 25 large cartons, all of them containing the fruits of years of research and writing. Ever since building seizures began at Harvard and last October's bombing of the Center for International Affairs, few teachers at Harvard, or for that matter at other major universities, keep files, documents, books, or other materials of scholarly value in their offices. Few Harvard professors stay late in their offices to work on their projects, for they know well which way the Weatherman wind is blowing.

Regardless of apprehension or risk, the life of an activist professor must go on, particularly for such a one as Professor Huntington who believes that in the field of foreign policy theory and practice are inseparable. His life now includes responsibility as coeditor for a new intellectual journal which boasts two unusual characteristics.

First, the magazine, *Foreign Policy*, has, he says, "no institutional memory," an apt phrase designed to cast into a state of retrospective oblivion the issue of Vietnam. In other words, the Vietnam debate, which for over a decade scarred so many institutions and publications, is no handicap for the quarterly, because it begins its existence at the close of the Vietnam debate.

Second, the magazine's 192 pages are bound into a simple yet distinctive format -- 10 inches high, not a unique dimension, but only 4½ inches wide, a most distinctive dimension except perhaps for odd-shaped children's books. (The column you are now reading is 2¾ inches wide.) The idea of the designer, Samuel N. Antupit, is that the magazine's narrow page makes it comfortably pocket-size and easy on the eye; each line can be taken in at a glance, without peripheral competition.

Professor Huntington's coeditor, Warren Demian Manshel, was a fellow-graduate student, two decades ago at Harvard, who went into banking. The magazine's risk capital came from Mr. Manshel, but only when both men finally agreed on the Vietnam issue. With fine disregard for Marxist-Leninist type-casting

Mr. Manshel, who bitterly opposed the Vietnam intervention and the Harvard academician who favored it. Since they both now agree that the United States must withdraw militarily from Vietnam, it is now possible for both men to "join together in an effort to stimulate rational discussion of the new directions required in American foreign policy."

A tall, bespectacled man of 43 years who heads Harvard's government department, Professor Huntington believes that the need for public discussion about America's world responsibilities is today all the greater because of the shift of American attention from international to domestic affairs even though international pressures have intensified.

Professor Huntington's cheerful, smiling manner belies a talent for apocalyptic discourse such as the editorial warning that while mishandling environmental and population problems might bring human life to a halt in a century or so, "it is well to remember that comparable incompetence in foreign policy could achieve substantially the same result in an hour or so."

"Look at the absence of concern among informed people," he said the other day, "about the way the Soviet Union is moving into the Third World. Had the Russians moved in the 1930's as they are moving today, around the Indian Ocean, and expanded their influence in the Arabian peninsula and Africa, the alarm would have been sounded. Today the nongovernmental foreign policy elites view all this with something like benign neglect and there may be good ground why we should not be concerned."

"Just as we had to become accustomed to Soviet nuclear parity we must now become accustomed to Soviet intervention parity in the Third World. We must now develop a whole new series of guidelines and understandings. If there were a revolution in some Persian Gulf sheikdom today and Russian and American destroyers happened to be there at the same moment, what is the code of behavior in these circumstances? Personally I don't think we should have a fleet in the Indian Ocean, but we should think over our long-term interests so that we don't get sucked into something."

"The classic case of Big Power confrontation was back in 1889 when warships of Britain, Germany, and the United States converged on the harbor of Samoa to decide which of the three countries should exercise control over the island's shaky government. Fortunately a hurricane blew all the ships out to sea otherwise they might have started shooting at each other. A diplomatic conference was called and it got settled."

Approved For Release 2004/09/03 : CIA-RDP88-01314R000100550008-7

Continued